## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.    | Applicant(s)  |  |
|--------------------|---------------|--|
| 10/577,008         | SUZUKI ET AL. |  |
| Examiner           | Art Unit      |  |
| Olga N. Chernyshev | 1649          |  |

|   | Olga N. Chernyshev   | 1649                                     |                  |  |
|---|--|--|------------------|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the o                          | correspondence add                       | ress             |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>05 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  |  |  |                  |  |
|   |  |  |                  |  |
| <ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date</li> </ul>  | of the final rejection.                                    |  |                  |  |
| <ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A<br/>no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la</li> </ul>  |  |  |                  |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (<br>MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i   |  | FIRST REPLY WAS FI                       | LED WITHIN TWO   |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The data-<br>have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext<br>under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s<br>set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later<br>may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b).<br>NOTICE OF APPEAL | of the fee. The appropri-<br>nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |                  |  |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp  |  |  |                  |  |
| filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the ap<br>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).   |  |  |                  |  |
| AMENDMENTS  |  |  |                  |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>  |  | cause                                    |                  |  |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  |  | L Bolow),                                |                  |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett  | ter form for appeal by materially red                      | ducing or simplifying t                  | ne issues for    |  |
| appeal; and/or<br>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c  | corresponding number of finally reje                       | ected claims.                            |                  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)  |  |  |                  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  |  | mpliant Amendment (                      | PTOL-324).       |  |
| <ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ol>  |  |  |                  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all<br/>non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | owable if submitted in a separate, t                       | timely filed amendmen                    | nt canceling the |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  | l be entered and an e                    | xplanation of    |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |  |  |                  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:  |  |  |                  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |  |                  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |  |                  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |  |  |                  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>  | vercome all rejections under appea                         | al and/or appellant fail                 | s to provide a   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br/>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>  | n of the status of the claims after er                     | ntry is below or attach                  | ed.              |  |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br>See Continuation Sheet.  | t does NOT place the application in                        | condition for allowan                    | ce because:      |  |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet.   | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).                                    |  |                  |  |
|   |  |  |                  |  |

/Olga N. Chernyshev/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1649 Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 10, as currently presented, encompasses a novel concept of diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease by measuring the level of co-localization of peptides, which raises issues of 112, first paragraph..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The request for consideration has been fully considered. Applicant submits that claim 10 "has been amended in a manner believed to be suggested by the Examiner", p. 4 of the Response. However, as fully explained in the previous communications of record, see Papers mailed on October 05, 2009 and January 27, 2010, "the specification fails to provide any support and guidance as how to practice the method as claimed because it is limited to demonstration of colocalization of Alcadein and APP in the brain of AD patients and absence of such colocalization in normal control samples". Claim 10, as currently presented, encompasses measurement of levels of colocalization of peptides/polypeptides in the brain, which is different from detection of presence or absence of these markers.

All rejections are maintained for the same reasons of record as directed to the previously presented claim limitations.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant is advised that the submission of the sequence listing on March 05, 2010 fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.821 through 1.825. Specifically, there is no substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of a "Sequence Listing" which includes all of the sequences that are present in the instant application and encompassed by these rules, and no statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.821 (e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(g) or 1.825(g), Applicant is further advised to review the content of the instant specification, as originally filled, for possibility of amendment so that it comples with 37 C.F.R. § 1.821(g) where requires a reference to a particular sequence identifier (SEO ID NO:) be made in the specification and claims wherever a reference is made to that sequence. See MPEP 2422 O4. See also notice to comply attached.